



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,927	11/24/2003	Marvin P. Loeb	Loeb.M-03	6910
75	590 03/11/2005		EXAMINER	
Patent Law & Venture Group		JOHNSON III, HENRY M		
Suite 150	-			
3140 Red Hill Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Costa Mesa CA 92626-3440			3739	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/721,927	LOEB, MARVIN P.	ED
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	The MAU INC DATE of this communication	Henry M Johnson, III	3739	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on the cover sheet t	vith the correspondence address -	••
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of th eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become a	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communicates ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	02 March 2004.		
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice unc	·		s is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the applicated 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 13-16 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 November 2003</u> Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	\mathbf{B} is/are: a) \mathbf{M} accepted or b) \mathbf{B} or the drawing(s) be held in abeyon orrection is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ag(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Business the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage	
Attachmen	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)	
2)	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Sign No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2, the "blanket" incorporation by reference is improper. See 37 CFR 1.57.

On page 8, both the end portion (line 27) and the adhesive (line 28) use the label 23.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: The steps of the claim are not consistent with the preamble. The steps are not interpretable as limiting the reuse of an optical fiber, without excessive reliance on the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, no separate sleeve is specifically cited and it is implied in claim 1 that the sleeve is part of the optical fiber. Therefore, the fingers as claimed would not grip the fiber.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,151,962 to Walker et al. Walker et al. teach fiber optic cable assemblies for use in surgical and medical applications. A handle (Fig. 7A, # 76) is disclosed with a central bore and a stem (Fig. 7A, # 80) that is interpreted as a cannula. The channel is axially aligned with the stem (Col. 8, line 30) and is a larger diameter than the stem (Fig. 7A). The transition from channel to stem is interpreted as a shoulder. Walker et al. further discloses a fiber optic may be secured to the handle by a hex bolt with a compression fitting. The interactions of the structure with an optical fiber are intended use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 8, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Walker et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,417,684 to Jackson et al. Walker et al. is discussed above, but does not teach a compression nut with axial fingers or tapered threads. Jackson et al. disclose a surgical device that includes a fitting with fingers (Fig. 31, # 434) and

Art Unit: 3739

tapered threads (Fig. 32, # 422). Compression fittings are well known in a plethora of arts and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the compression fitting of Jackson et al. in the invention of Walker et al. as one of many alternative compression fitting configurations. Likewise, the use of a compressible tube in such fittings is well known.

Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Walker et al. Walker discloses a bend distal end (Fig. 7A), but does not disclose using Nitinol [®] or other super-elastic material. Super-elastic materials are well known in the art and it would have obvious to one skilled in the art to use a super-elastic material if the device was used with a complimentary device that would alter its configuration and it was desired to have the device return to a predetermined shape.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patents 5300,061 to Easley et al. and 4,756,597 to Hahn et al. both teach a stepped passage for an optical fiber capable of limiting movement due to a sleeve or cladding having a larger diameter than the fiber core. U.S. Patent 5,913,853 to Loeb et al. discloses a compression fitting to secure an optic fiber.

Art Unit: 3739

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry M Johnson, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Henry M. Johnson, III

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3739